

**REMARKS**

The specification has been amended at p. 1, line 19 to correct a minor clerical error. Claim 1 has also been amended to correct a minor clerical error. No new matter has been entered.

Turning now to the art rejection, and considering first the rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Kim et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,492,698 ("Kim"), Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been made in error. Claim 1 requires that the conductor foil have an end section which is formed as a plug section adapted to be connected with a complementary plug. This feature is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kim. To the contrary, Kim states that the end section of the conductor foil which is opposite to the opto-electronic component is formed as a connection area 306 for electrically coupling to a printed circuit board 114 (see col. 5, lines 29-30). Accordingly, the end section of the conductor foil does not form a plug section. Further, it is clearly visible in Figure 3 that the respective end section of the conductor foil is in no way adapted to be inserted into a complementary plug. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Considering now the rejection of claim 2 as anticipated by Kim, the Examiner argues that the elements numbered 250 and 260 form a spacer serving as a stop for the optical waveguide plug connector. Applicants respectfully submit that this is incorrect. Element 250 is a lens alignment element, and element 260 is a receptacle. There is no indication at all that either of these elements serves as a stop. Claim 2 is thus patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.  
130 W. CUSHING STREET  
TUCSON, AZ 85701  
TEL. 520.882.7623  
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET  
MANCHESTER, NH 03101  
TEL. 603.668.1400  
FAX. 603.668.8567

Regarding the rejection of claims 3 through 9 as anticipated by Kim, claim 3 requires that the spacer be a sealing frame. Nowhere does Kim disclose, teach or suggest that a sealing frame is used in the assembly. Claim 3 is thus patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 2, from which it depends, as well as for its own additional limitations. Likewise, claims 4 through 9 are patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 3, from which they depend either directly or indirectly, as well as for their own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 3 through 9 should be withdrawn.

Considering now the rejection of claims 10 and 11 as anticipated by Kim, claim 10 requires that the opto-electronic component be arranged on a leadframe made of metal and act as a heat sink. Kim does not disclose, teach or suggest such a leadframe. First, Kim mentions that the opto-electronic component (laser array 430) is mounted to substrate 300 (see col. 6, lines 30-36). There is no mention of a heat sink in connection with the opto-electronic component. Kim does, in fact, mention a heat sink. However, it is element 210 which forms the heat sink, and this element is part of the housing. Claim 10 is thus patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its own additional limitations. Likewise, claim 11 is patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 10, from which it depends, as well as for its own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 10 and 11 should be withdrawn.

Turning now to the rejection of claim 12 as anticipated by Kim, this claim is patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

With reference now to the rejection of claims 13 through 16 as anticipated by Kim, claim 13 requires that a level of bond pads of the opto-electronic component be located above a level of bond pads of the driver/amplifier chip. This is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kim. Kim simply mentions that wires 434 can be utilized to directly connect each of the lasers in the array 430 to the driver circuit 440 (see col. 6, lines 40-42). There is no indication whatsoever regarding the level of the bond pads. Claim 13 is thus patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 12, from which it depends, as well as for its own additional limitations. Likewise, claims 14 through 16 are patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 13, from which they depend either directly or indirectly, as well as for their own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 13 through 16 should be withdrawn.

Considering now the rejection of claims 17 and 18 as anticipated by Kim, these claims are patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 17 and 18 should be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claim 19 as anticipated by Kim, claim 19 requires that additional control elements be provided by means of which operating parameters of the receiver can be adjusted. In rejecting claim 19, the Examiner refers to column 4, lines 26 to 43 of Kim. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's reference to this portion of the specification is misplaced. This portion of the specification simply states that the optical module can be either a transmitter, a receiver, or a transceiver. There is no mention of additional control elements. Further, there is no indication of what parameters of the transceiver could be adjusted. Claim 19 is thus patentable for the same reasons given above

with respect to claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 20 through 22 as anticipated by Kim, these claims are patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 3, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 20 through 22 should be withdrawn.

With reference now to the rejection of claim 23 as anticipated by Kim, this claim requires that the plug section be mounted so as to be displaceable. In rejecting claim 23, the Examiner refers to Figure 7 of Kim. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's reference to Figure 7 of Kim is misplaced. First, the portion of the conductor foil which is visible in Figure 7 is not a plug section, but rather, a contact section which is provided for being connected to a circuit board, as has been explained above with respect to claim 1. Further, even if the respective section of the conductor foil were considered to be a plug section, such plug section would not be displaceable. Kim explains that the respective portion is coupled to a second surface of heat sink 210 by using an adhesive (see col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 5). In other words, the respective portion of the conductor foil is rigidly connected to the heat sink. It is not displaceable. Claim 23 is thus patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its own additional limitations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn.

Having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, the Application is believed to be in order for allowance. Early and favorable action are respectfully requested.

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.  
130 W. CUSHING STREET  
TUCSON, AZ 85701  
TEL. 520.882.7623  
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET  
MANCHESTER, NH 03101  
TEL. 603.668.1400  
FAX. 603.668.8567



Serial No. 10/631,296  
Docket No. PRINZ H1799  
Amendment A

In the event there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge them (or credit any overpayment) to our Deposit Account Number 08-1391.

Respectfully submitted,

Norman P. Soloway  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 24,315

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 8, 2004, at Tucson, Arizona.

By

NPS/KMD:sb

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.  
130 W. CUSHING STREET  
TUCSON, AZ 85701  
TEL. 520.882.7623  
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET  
MANCHESTER, NH 03101  
TEL. 603.668.1400  
FAX. 603.668.8567